



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/682,766	10/16/2001	Jonas Forssell	200-0642 GMB	9908

22844 7590 02/12/2003

FORD GLOBAL TECHNOLOGIES, INC  
SUITE 600 - PARKLANE TOWERS EAST  
ONE PARKLANE BLVD.  
DEARBORN, MI 48126

EXAMINER

GUTMAN, HILARY L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3612

DATE MAILED: 02/12/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
09/682,766

Applicant(s)  
Forssell

Examiner  
Hilary Gutman

Art Unit  
3612



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jan 6, 2003
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 25-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 27 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 25, 26, and 28-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on Oct 16, 2001 is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some\* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 3612

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Information Disclosure Statement*

1. The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609 A(1) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

### *Drawings*

2. The proposed drawing correction and/or the proposed substitute sheets of drawings, filed on 1/16/2003 have been acknowledged and approved by the examiner.
3. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the "vehicle door" of claim 29 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

A proper drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The correction to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### *Specification*

4. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

Art Unit: 3612

On page 2, [0008], lines 2-3, the phrase "low counted per kg profile" is awkward and unclear. Perhaps this phrase should be deleted.

On page 2, [0011], lines 1 and 2, the language referring to claims, specifically, "claim 11" is inappropriate language for the specification since the claims and claim numbers may change throughout prosecution of this application. Perhaps the phrase should be "...by a profile and a body section according to the present invention, which makes..."

Also the replacement paragraph 46 for page 6 includes "[verticals]" and "[hobbing of]" which should both be deleted. Appropriate correction is required.

5. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Perhaps "said" should be replaced with "the" in all instances.

Art Unit: 3612

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 25-26 and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 25 recites the limitation "said internal triangular section" in line 8. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 26 recites the limitation "a stiffener means" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 28 recites the limitation "a flange" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 29 recites the limitation "a flange" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 30 recites the limitation "a flange" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 3612

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in-

- (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or
- (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a).

9. Claims 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hopton et al.

Hopton et al. disclose a metal profile for a vehicle body section, the profile comprising: at least two side walls 24, 24, a base plate 90 and at least two support walls 126, 128, wherein the at least two side walls 24, 24 and the base plate 90 constitute a sectional area with at least three hollow sections, wherein the base plate and the at least two support walls constitute an internal section, of the metal profile with a substantially triangular sectional area (Figure 6) and the metal profile is provided with stiffener means 84, the internal section having substantially three corners.

At least one of the support walls of the internal section has the stiffener means 84.

*Allowable Subject Matter*

10. Claim 27 is allowed.
11. Claims 28-30 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 3612

*Response to Arguments*

12. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 25-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

*Conclusion*

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The cited references show other body sections similar to that of the current invention.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be directed to Hilary L. Gutman whose telephone number is (703) 305-0496.

15. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Assistant Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231

**or faxed to:**


(703) 305-3597, (for formal communications intended for entry)

**or:**

(703) 305-0285, (for informal or draft communications, please clearly label  
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT").

hlg

February 4, 2003

  
D. GLENN DAYOAN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600 26103